

REMARKS

Claims 1-6, 8-18, 20-24, 27 and 28 are pending in the application.

Claims 1-6, 8-18, 20-24, 27 and 28 have been rejected.

Claims 1, 10, 13, and 22 have been amended.

Double Patenting

Claims 1-6, 8-18, 20-24, and 27-28 are provisionally rejected under 35 USC § 101 as purportedly claiming the same invention as that of claims 1-28 of copending Application No. 10/688,094. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Applicants respectfully submit that the previously made amendments are sufficient to overcome a statutory double patenting rejection. As noted in the MPEP, "A rejection based on the statutory type of double patenting can be avoided by amending the conflicting claims so that they are not coextensive in scope." MPEP 804.02 (emphasis supplied).

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 10, 13, and 22 are not coextensive in scope with the claims of copending Application No. 10/688,094. Independent claims 1, 10, 13, and 22 recite features not recited in the claims of copending Application No. 10/688,094. In fact, independent claims 1, 10, 13, and 22 recite elements that are not disclosed anywhere in the specification of copending Application No. 10/688,094. For example, independent claims 1, 10, 13, and 22 recite determining that essential data elements of a common invoice data object format comprise "an identification data element, a base data element, a pricing data element, a shipping data element, and a line item details data element." Such features are not recited in the claims of copending Application No. 10/688, 094.

The Advisory Action mailed May 5, 2009 states that this invention's custom data element covers invoice adjustment information as per copending Application No. 10/688, 094. However, Applicants note that no reference is made to invoice adjustment information in claim 40, or anywhere else in this invention's specification. For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims of the two applications are not coextensive in scope and that the statutory double patenting rejection is overcome.

The Office Action states that the current application and copending Application No. 10/688, 094 comprise a single invention and that the issue of priority under 35 USC 102(g) and possibly 35 USC 102(f) must be resolved. However, as noted above, the current application and copending Application No. 10/688, 094 are not directed towards the same invention. As captured in the claims, the current application is directed towards invoice information while copending Application No. 10/688, 094 is directed towards invoice adjustment information. To assert, as the Office Action does, that the two applications are directed towards a single invention impermissibly ignores the differences between invoice information and invoice adjustment information. As noted above, examples of such differences are reflected both in the claims and the specifications of the respective applications. For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner's reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections to these claims and an indication of the allowability of same.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. §101

Claims 1-6, 8 and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed invention is purportedly directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. However, in order to expedite prosecution, Applicants have amended claim 1 to recite that the translating is tied to a processor and the essential data elements are stored in a memory coupled to the processor. Support for these amendments is found, at least, at ¶¶ [0047-0049]. For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner's reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections to these claims and an indication of the allowability of same.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-6, 8-18, 20-24 and 27-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,043,687 issued to Knauss, et al. ("Knauss"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Applicants respectfully submit that the

cited portions of Knauss fail to disclose each feature of independent claim 1, which has been amended to recite:

A method comprising:

- receiving invoice information in an application-specific data object format from each of a plurality of applications;
- translating the invoice information into a common invoice data object format, wherein
 - the translating is performed by a processor,
 - the common invoice data object format comprises at least one custom data element, and
 - the custom data element is configured to allow customization of the common invoice data object format; and
- determining essential data elements of the common invoice data object format, wherein
 - the essential data elements are stored in a memory coupled to the processor, and
 - the essential data elements comprise
 - an identification data element,
 - a base data element,
 - a pricing data element,
 - a shipping data element, and
 - a line item details data element.

For example, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited portions of Knauss fail to disclose, at least, “the common invoice data object format comprises at least one custom data element, and the custom data element is configured to allow customization of the common invoice data object format.” Support for these amendments is found, at least, at ¶ [0040] of the Specification.

As noted in Applicants’ specification, customizability is a problem in previous efforts made to define standard data models. *See, e.g.*, Specification, ¶ [0007]. The amendments made to claim 1 further illustrate the features provided by the claimed method to address problems of customizability. This is demonstrated, at least, by inclusion of one or more custom data elements that allow customization of the data object format. In a contrary approach, Knauss explicitly teaches that in order for Knauss’s system to accommodate changes in a document, a new mapping must be created. *See* Knauss 8:38-46. Applicants respectfully submit that the cited portions of Knauss fail to

disclose custom data elements configured to allow customization of the common data object format.

Applicants respectfully submit that the remarks made above with regard to claim 1 apply with equal force to independent claims 10, 13, and 22 (which have been amended to include similar features. For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner's reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections to these claims, as well as all claims that depend therefrom, and an indication of the allowability of same.

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein, the application and the claims therein are believed to be in condition for allowance without any further examination and a notice to that effect is solicited. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephonic interview, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at 512-439-5092.

If any extensions of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) are required in order for this submission to be considered timely, Applicants hereby petition for such extensions. Applicants also hereby authorize that any fees due for such extensions or any other fee associated with this submission, as specified in 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or § 1.17, be charged to deposit account 502306.

Respectfully submitted,



Shawn Doman
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 60,362
Telephone: (512) 439-5092
Facsimile: (512) 439-5099